

Application Number 09/963,806  
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 23, 2006

## REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated March 23, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 16, 20, 29, 34, 38, 44, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 64 and 65, and cancelled claims 6, 12, 25 and 30. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 14-18, 20-24, 26-29, 32-36, 38, 40-47 and 50-66 are pending.

### Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 16-18, 43, 58-63 and 66. In addition, the Examiner indicated that claims 34-36 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner objected to claims 6, 12, 25 and 30 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Amendments

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 6, independent claim 11 to include the limitations of allowable claim 12, and independent claim 29 to include the limitations of allowable claim 30. In addition, Applicant has amended independent claim 20 to include the limitations of claim 25, but not the limitations of intervening claim 24. Amended claim 20 is similar in scope to amended claim 1, which has been indicated to be allowable, upon inclusion of the limitations of claim 6. Amended claims 1, 11, 20 and 29, and pertinent dependent claims, should now be allowable, in light of these amendments and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6, 12, 25 and 30.

Applicant also has amended claim 34 to refer to a "processor-readable data storage medium" and to specify that the symbolic name is provided from the server to a user. In this manner, amended claim 34 should overcome the rejections under sections 101 and 112, second paragraph.

Applicant has amended claim 43 to specify that output is provided from a server to a client interface. In this manner, amended claim 43 should overcome the rejection under section 112, second paragraph.

Application Number 09/963,806  
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 23, 2006

Applicant has amended claims 38, 44, 46, 47, 50-52, 64 and 65 to specify output in an XML-tagged format.

#### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29, 34, 38, 43, 44, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 58 and 64-66 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In support, the examiner stated that the functionality of “receiving output from a router,” “querying a server” and “invoking a CLI” is unclear in terms of what device is actually performing the receiving, querying, or invoking. As an example, the Examiner stated that it is clear that the output “is from a router” and the response is “from a server” and directed to “a user.” The Examiner suggested that Applicant amend the claims, as appropriate, to provide such clarifying language.

Applicant generally traverses this rejection. In response, Applicant points out that the majority of the claims, and particularly claim 1, already include such “clarifying” language. For example, claim 1 already specifies receiving output from a router system module and providing a response from the server to a user.

Other claims include similar clarifying language. In addition, claims 34 and 43 have been amended to specify providing information from a server to a user (claim 34) or from a server to a client interface (claim 43). Therefore, it appears that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be moot.

#### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20, 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner again did not cite any authority in support of the position that claims are nonstatutory if they are “not limited to tangible embodiments.” Therefore, Applicant maintains that the rejection under section 101 is wholly improper.

In the interest of expediting prosecution toward immediate allowance, however, Applicant has amended claim 20, 29 and 34 to specify a processor-readable data storage medium. Notwithstanding Applicant’s traversal of the rejection under section 101, this amendment makes

Application Number 09/963,806  
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 23, 2006

clear that claims 20, 29, and 34 pertain to tangible media. Therefore, the rejection under section 101, regardless of its questionable basis, should now be moot.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 20-23, 38, 40, 41, 47, 50, 51, 52, 64 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellovin et al. (US 5,958,052) in view of Wilson et al. (US 2002/0009078), rejected claims 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 26, 27, 29, 32, 44 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellovin et al. in view of Wilson et al. and in further view of Tan et al. (US 6,314,469), and rejected claims 9, 28 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellovin et al. in view of Wilson et al. and in further view of Pabla (US2002/0156875).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting prosecution toward immediate allowance, and without prejudice to submission of additional claims of similar scope in a continuation application, Applicant has amended the rejected claims to specify that output is provided by a system module in an XML-tagged format.

None of the prior art references applied by the Examiner discloses or suggests such a feature in combination with the other limitations of Applicant's claims. Moreover, the Examiner has indicated that incorporation of similar features in other claims renders those claims allowable over the prior art.

In light of the fundamental differences between the inventions defined by the amended claims the teachings of the applied references, Applicant reserves further comment concerning the teachings of such references. In reserving comment, Applicant neither admits nor acquiesces in the propriety of the rejections under 103, nor the legitimacy of the Examiner's interpretation of the references or the limitations in Applicant's claims.

Application Number 09/963,806  
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 23, 2006

### CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

June 23, 2006

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By: 

Name: Steven J. Shumaker  
Reg. No.: 36,275